REMARKS

Examiner Owens is again thanked for his thorough evaluation of the present application. It is strongly felt that independent Claim 19, as previously submitted in 12/01, as a twice amended Claim, is clearly distinguishable from Examiner's cited prior art, and can not be construed to be obvious from a combination of Examiner's cited prior art, specifically Iwasaki (US 5,907,772), in view of Fukase (US 5,656,529).

Fukase, in August of 1997, describes agglomerated metal silicide on the surfaces of a specific shape. Iwasaki forms a specific shape for a storage node structure, a shape comprised with protruding vertical features surrounded or connected at the bottom of the vertical features by a thin, flat shape, thus resulting in a storage node with increased surface area as a result of the surfaces of the vertical features. Iwasaki's objective was indeed to increase the surface area of the storage node structure via employment of the vertical features, clearly seen in col1, lines 15 - 25. If agglomerated metal silicide, as invented by Fukase for a structure without vertical features, is/was obvious, why didn't Iwasaki, in May of 1999, whose objective was to increase storage node surface area implement an agglomerated metal silicide layer on all exposed surfaces of his storage node structure, specifically on all exposed surfaces of the vertical features? The answer has to

be that the combination of Fukase and Iwasaki is not obvious.

In addition it is believed to be a stretch on Examiner's part, to equate Iwaski's conductive layer to applicant's uniformly doped vertical features. It is presumptuous to assume Iwasaki would in situ dope the layer used for the vertical features. If in fact the layer was in situ doped it certainly was not claimed as a uniformly doped feature, as applicant has clearly claimed for his structure. Therefore it is believed that the inclusion by applicant of a uniformly doped vertical feature is unique when compared to prior art (Iwasaki), and should be sufficient to gain allowance of independent Claim 19.

Therefore it is felt that applicant's structure, described in amended independent Claim 19, is novel and unique, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. Applicants use of a combination of features such as: a storage node structure comprised of an cylindrical polysilicon shape featuring uniformily doped vertical shapes; completely covered by agglomerated metal silicide layer; is clearly distinguishable, and novel, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. Again the prior art (Iwasaki), whose objective was to increase surface area, was described years after the Fukase prior art (1997), which described a procedure for forming an agglomerated or increased surface area. If this combination is as obvious as Examiner Claims why was it not obvious

to Iwasaki? In addition none of the cited prior art describe a uniformly doped vertical feature. Therefore it is strongly felt that no combination of prior arts can be used to describe applicants structure. Applicant has claimed his process in detail. The structure described in Figs. 1 - 10, and in Claims 19 and 21, are both believed to be novel and patentable over these various references, because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that the combination of claimed elements would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. We therefore request Examiner Owens to reconsider his rejections of independent Claim 19, and of dependent Claim 21, referencing amended independent Claim 19, in view of these arguments.

Allowance of all claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Owens not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned attorney at 845-452-5863, to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg # 37,761